



GEF

Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.19/Inf.11
May 8, 2002

GEF Council
May 15-17, 2002

**REPORT OF THE TENTH MEETING OF STAP II,
MARCH 27-29, 2002
NAIROBI, KENYA**

(Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel)

Report of the Tenth Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel II (STAP II)

March 27-29, Nairobi, Kenya

**STAP Secretariat
United Nations Environment Programme**

Introduction

1. In accordance with its Programme of Work, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel II (STAP II) held its Tenth Meeting from March 27-29, 2002 at the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Headquarters, Nairobi, Kenya.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

2. The opening plenary of the Seventh Meeting of STAP II commenced at 10.00 a.m. on March 27-29, 2002. The meeting was opened by Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Chairman of STAP who welcomed the participants to Nairobi and expressed his gratitude for the efforts made by everyone to attend the meeting.
3. The meeting was also addressed by Dr. Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of UNEP. He welcomed the participants to UNEP Headquarters at Nairobi and acknowledged the significant contribution STAP II has made to the GEF. He made reference to the decision made at the last meeting of the Ministerial Forum For the Establishment of an Intergovernmental Panel on Global Change and the possible role STAP members could play in this process, either individually or collectively.
4. The Executive Director also reiterated the need for scientists to be independent, in order to gain to the maximum from their intellectual capacity. He also indicated the need to take into account the rules and procedure of the United Nations. In reference to the Second GEF Assembly to be convened in China in October 2002, the Executive Director suggested that one issue which could be a theme for a scientific session is that of Environmental Assessments for achieving GEF impacts. Such a session would enable the wider community to benefit from the accumulated experience of the various assessments financed by the GEF. He also reiterated UNEP's commitment to STAP and increasing the central role it plays in the GEF.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Draft Provisional Agenda and Organization of Work

A. Agenda and Organization of Work

5. The meeting adopted the draft provisional agenda and organization of work contained in UNEP/GEF/STAP II/10/2/Add.1 and UNEP/GEF/STAP II/10/2/Add.3.

B. Participation

6. The STAP members attending the meeting were Prof. Madhav Gadgil, Dr. Christine Padoch, Dr. Setijati Sastrapradja, Prof. Paola Rossi, Dr. Michel Colombier, Dr. Zhou Dadi, Prof. Shuzo Nishioka, Prof. Eric Odada, Dr. Julia Carabias, Prof. Dennis Anderson, Dr. Stephen Karekezi and Prof. Angela Wagener.

7. The representatives from the GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies who attended the meeting were; Mr. Avani Vaish, Mr. Juha Uitto and Dr. Yasemin Biro (GEF Secretariat); Dr. Richard Hosier UNDP); Mr. Sam Wedderburn (World Bank); Mr. Michael Waite (UNEP); Dr. Mark Griffith and Ms. Anne-Marie Verbeken (STAP Secretariat). Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif, Director, Division of GEF, UNEP participated in selected segments of the meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Reports on Inter-sessional Activities by GEF partners, STAP Chairman and other STAP members, Including Planning for the STAP Expert Group Workshop on "Innovative Technologies for the Elimination/Reduction of POPs: The Way Forward"

8. The representative from World Bank gave an overview of the Bank's Environmental Strategy and emphasised the poverty and environmental linkages. He indicated that global environmental issues have now been integrated in the Bank's country assistance strategy. The meeting was also informed of the Bank's ongoing preparations for the World Summit to be convened in South Africa later this year.
9. With respect to specific issues of relevance to STAP, the Bank's representative made reference to the need for a better identification of incremental cost in sustainable use and OP#12 projects and the role STAP could play in this process. He also acknowledged STAP efforts in the convening of the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Adaptation and the STAP Brainstorming on Sustainable Transport. He also reiterated the benefits which have resulted from the use of the STAP Roster of Experts, which has generally made positive contributions towards improving the quality of project design.
10. The representative from the GEF Secretariat highlighted the main decisions made by the GEF Council at its last meeting. Specific reference was made to the increase of STAP from 12 to 15 members; the proposed designation of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and land degradation as focal areas of the GEF and the strategic priorities in the selection of projects.
11. He also brought the meeting up-to-date on the replenishment process, as well as the planning for the preparatory process for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. In this regard, reference was made to the Roundtables which have been planned by the GEF. The meeting was also informed of the progress made to date on modalities for the management by the GEF of the LDC Adaptation Fund.
12. The representative from UNDP brought the meeting up-to-date on the Capacity 21 Programme as well as UNDP's preparation for the WSSD. He also acknowledged STAP efforts in convening the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Adaptation and Vulnerability and the Brainstorming on Sustainable Transport.
13. The representative from the CCD Secretariat in his statement underscored the role played by STAP in raising the profile of land degradation over the past five years. He informed the meeting that the COP/CCD has embraced

the GEF Council decision to designate land degradation as a GEF focal area and are looking forward to the Second GEF Assembly.

14. The representative from UNEP brought the meeting up-to-date on the international environmental governance debate. Specific reference was also made to the enhancement by UNEP of partnerships with the scientific and technical community. With respect to the WSSD, the meeting was informed of a number of UNEP initiatives being planned, namely, the launching of the Global Environmental Outlook (GEO) covering a period of approximately 30 years and the GEOs for Africa, Asia and Latin America.
15. The representative from UNEP also updated the meeting of UNEP's involvement in the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). In this regard, specific reference was made to the UNEP/GEF medium-sized project aimed at assisting the continent in developing the environmental component of NEPAD. Reference was also made to plans being made for Biosafety Day on May 22, 2002 as a means of raising public awareness on issues relating to biosafety/biotechnology. In this regard, a Biosafety Forum is being organised for school children. The output of the Forum will be a Children's Biosafety Programme.
16. The STAP Chairman reported on his participation in the GEF Council Meeting of December 5-7, 2002. The meeting was informed that in addition to his statement, a number of other documents were submitted for the Council's attention, namely:
 - ❖ The Report of the Ninth Meeting of STAP, October 23-25, 2001;
 - ❖ Report of the STAP Selective Review of the China Boilers Project;
 - ❖ Report of the STAP Selective Review on Philippines Conservation of Priority Protected Areas Project;
 - ❖ The Annual Review of the Use and Management of the STAP Roster of Experts (July 2000 – June 2001).
17. The Chair informed the meeting that the discussion which followed his statement was positive. He noted that all delegations which took the floor congratulated STAP for the excellent contribution it has made to the GEF over the years. All delegations also concurred that STAP plays a very central role in GEF operations and this should be increased. In this regard, a number of specific recommendations were made, namely: that given the resource constraints which will be faced by the GEF, STAP could play a greater role in project selection; a system could be implemented whereby STAP members are expected to follow a selection of projects and STAP should become more involved in post evaluation reviews.
18. The Chairman also made specific reference to the Council decision which requested the Chair of STAP to prepare for the consideration by the Council at its next meeting a report on STAP's views, proposal and recommendations for improving STAP's efficiency, the greater use of experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition and the role of STAP in the GEF.

19. Prof. Shuzo Nishioka reported on his participation in the Seventh Session of the UNFCCC/COP held in Marrakech from October 29 – November 10, 2001. A number of issues of relevance to the GEF were highlighted, namely, the establishment of new funding mechanisms (i.e. Adaptation Fund, Special Climate Fund and LDC Fund) and their governance structures and additional guidance on the implementation of Stage II adaptation activities and establishing pilot or demonstration projects to show how adaptation planning and assessment can be translated into projects.
20. Dr. Christine Padoch reported on her participation in the Second Meeting of the Ad-Hoc Open ended Inter-Sessional Working Group on Article (8j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biodiversity, and more particularly on the Expert Panel on "*Traditional Knowledge (Indigenous Science) in the Management and Use of Natural Resources*". She informed the meeting that in the presentation she focused on need for an increased role for local knowledge in GEF programmes and projects. Issues which arose out of the discussion related to how local knowledge can respond appropriately to new problems and opportunities and its implications for the GEF.
21. The proposed "*STAP Expert Group Workshop on Innovative Technologies for the Elimination/Reduction of POPs: The Way Forward*" was also considered under this agenda item. After much discussion, it was agreed that the "Expert Group Workshop on POPs" should be convened from June 12-14, 2002 immediately before the next meeting of STAP. The background note and draft agenda for the workshop is appended in Annex 1.

Agenda Item 4: Adding Greater Value to STAP Contributions to GEF Operations: Discussion on the Draft STAP Paper to the GEF Council

22. The STAP Chairman introduced the document and outlined the process leading to its preparation. This included intense consultation among STAP members who submitted specific proposals based on their experiences; circulation of the document firstly to the CEO/Chairman of the GEF and the Executive Director of UNEP; this was followed by a wider circulation to all the entities in the GEF family inviting comments.
23. The Chair outlined the main suggestions contained in the document. These formed the basis for a detailed discussion. The main suggestions summarized by the STAP Chair were:
 - ❖ STAP should be asked to divide its efforts roughly equally between developing a forward looking agenda and responding to corporate demands perceived by the IAs, EAs and GEF Secretariat;
 - ❖ An overlapping system of STAP membership should be instituted involving the following elements: (a) each of the 15 – STAP members will have a three year term; (b) five old members will retire and five new members will be inducted every year; (c) a Chair will have a two year term, and (d) STAP members themselves will elect a new Chair every two years from amongst the five members who have completed one year of their three year term;
 - ❖ S&T community should be specifically mentioned as a component in the stakeholder participation annexe of GEF project proposals;

- ❖ Establishment of Scientific and Technical Networks and focal points to strengthen GEF at the regional/sub-regional levels, particularly in targeted research;
- ❖ Corporate identification of targeted research priorities while leaving the option open for agencies to identify targeted research projects;
- ❖ Establishment of an S&T forum;
- ❖ Each STAP member should be involved in a scientific and technical focused selective review in the very first year of her/his tenure;
- ❖ Corporate demands may be conveyed to STAP as and when they arise in a written and structured manner;
- ❖ STAP should regularly interact with the CEO, Assistant CEO, and the Executive Coordinators to set priorities for the STAP work programme;
- ❖ Secretariat and IAs be requested to provide specific written feed-back in relation to STAP strategic advice and the selective reviews;
- ❖ Encourage more extended involvement of GEF roster experts over the project cycle;
- ❖ Encourage STAP to work with roster experts from developing countries, and countries with economies in transition to overcome the GEF exposure barrier;
- ❖ Encourage simultaneous involvement of two reviewers in a project, with at least one of them being from a recipient country.

24. After much discussion, it was agreed that the issues raised in the discussion would be incorporated by the STAP Chair in the revised document and circulated to STAP members before its final submission to the GEF Council for its consideration. The GEF Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies were unanimous in indicating that the document should reflect the views of STAP.

Agenda Item 5: Improving the Management of the STAP Roster of Experts, Including Addressing the Issue of Expertise in Traditional Knowledge and Practices of Indigenous and Local Communities

25. The Panel considered a number of issues relevant to the management of the roster, including the issues raised by the OPS2 study on the STAP Roster of Experts.

(a) The Second Overall Performance Study of the GEF in its final report indicated that the STAP roster of Experts needs '*major pruning*'. The following observations were made by the Panel on this issue:

- (i) That "*removing experts is a task that cannot be undertaken without criteria to do so*". The operational guidelines of the roster provide no other criteria for removal than poor performance. As a consequence, since most of the experts cannot be called upon to perform, it is impossible to assess their performance, and hence they cannot be removed from the roster on the basis of non-performance. Alternatively, criteria for removal of unused experts that are not provided for in the Operational Guidelines must be formulated and agreed to by all the GEF partners before becoming operational. This point was also made by the STAP Chairman in his statement to the GEF Council in December 2001.

In this regard, the following criteria were suggested by the panel for further consideration by the GEF family in GEF III:

- Experts who in the view of two IAs are considered to be too academic in orientation, particularly lacking in recent project experience in the field;
- Limited geographical field experience. Must have experience working in developing countries.

(ii) There are two dimensions to the notion of "pruning" the roster:

- Removal of experts from the roster due to death, retirement and/or loss of contact, which is a continuous process which has been implemented over the past few year. This is essentially updating. As a result of updating the roster, 71 experts have been removed since 1999.
- Removal due to non-performance. To-date STAP has not received any recommendation from IAs for the removal of any roster of experts due to non-performance.

A third dimension - removal due to non-use, based on agreed criteria, is yet to be agreed upon. It nevertheless raises two questions, namely: why some experts with much drawn upon expertise have not been used and what is the optimal size of the roster, and thus the number of experts required in each relevant field of expertise, taking into account the evolving needs of the GEF?

(iii) Based on disciplinary analysis of the roster, undertaken in order to get an indication of the numbers of roster experts in each discipline, it is evident that it will be difficult to do a "major pruning" of the roster given the spread of the roster experts in the various disciplines. From the analysis it is evident that the number of roster experts in the various disciplines is not significant (less than 5 in most areas). Most experts are concentrated in Ecology (30), of which 33% were used over the last 5 years; 16 in agricultural sciences of which none have been used; 13 in economics of which 38% were used; 15 in pollution of which 13% have been used; 12 in atmospheric sciences of which none were used.

The fundamental issue which arises from the disciplinary analysis is not so much the pruning of the roster, but instead how can the Roster of Experts be more fully utilized. Some areas of expertise are clearly underutilized, particularly in the specialized areas, such as atmospheric sciences. Many of the unused experts on the roster possess valuable but very specialized skills and expertise that may still be useful in cases where a more technically specialized opinion is required. It was however, concluded that the under utilization of experts seem to be related to the high degree of specialization of

some roster experts in subjects that form only a small part of the technical and scientific basis of projects. One way of addressing this could be to change the way in which the qualifications of the experts are presented in the Roster, the lack of developing country experience on the part of some roster experts and lack of familiarity with GEF procedures were also highlighted as possible reasons contributing to the under utilization of roster experts.

In addition, a number of changes to the Guidelines for Management of the Roster were suggested as a means to increase the use of the Roster of Experts. These are:

- No roster expert should be used for more than two reviews in any one financial year;
- The use of at least two roster experts for each GEF funded project, with at least one of those coming from a developing country.

No final agreement was made on these suggestions. It was further considered that in some circumstances (i.e. complicated transboundary projects), it might be impractical to expect one roster expert to cover the breath of disciplines involved. Therefore, STAP III should consider how flexibility could be built into the system to allow the use of more than one expert when required. On the second suggestion, it was highlighted that consideration be given to shifting the emphasis from the roster expert being from a developing country to an expert having developing country experience.

- (iv) At the end of FY01 (June 2001), after 5 years of use, the number of Experts contained in the Roster (351) was slightly lower than (368) when the Roster became operational in 1996. This resulted from experts being removed from the roster due to death, retirement and/or loss of contact. At the beginning of FY2002 80 experts were added to the Roster of Experts to fill gaps created by an expanding GEF.

26. The general conclusion which resulted from the analysis of the STAP Roster of Experts is that the issue is not necessarily the "pruning" of the roster but what modalities can be put in place to maximize the use of the Roster Experts. On the contrary, it was felt that the Roster of Experts should be further expanded to address new areas such as land degradation and POPs.

- (b) The OPS2 also recommended that it is ". . . seeking STAP recommendations for appropriate changes to improve the project review system". Despite the fact that the review system has matured since FY97 and that the role of the reviewer is better understood, the reviews are more often than not perceived as the completion of an administrative step in the project cycle. Since the review by the roster expert comes at a very late stage in the project design stage, namely immediately before submission of the final project proposal to the GEF, the impact of a roster review on the fundamental design of a project is rather limited. It also puts a lot of pressure on the project proponent to select a well-known

reviewer used before. This leads in turn to an intensive use of a small pool of experts from the roster. Moreover, the roster reviewer is given a very short notice in many instances, constraining the amount of research and consulting with networks that can be done.

A questionnaire survey was carried out among the 97 roster experts used over the past 5 years. The response rate was about 60%. The key questions in the questionnaire related to the review system (timing, process, TOR, feedback) and how it could be improved. 50% of the reviewers felt that more lead time should be given, (i.e. at least two weeks notice) for project reviews. The roster experts were in general satisfied with the kind of guidance received from the IAs, with the exception of "inexperienced" reviewers with limited GEF exposure. The majority felt that they lack feedback from the IAs on what is most useful in a review or how the review was used to improve the project. There is a general consensus that feedback should be made a common practice in order for them to better understand their role and feel more valued.

On the question on covering all aspects of a project in a review, most reviewers felt that it depends much on the scope and complexity of the project and on the expertise of the reviewer, and not on the design of the TOR. The TOR were generally perceived as adequate, although some reviewers remarked that they seem to be designed for the needs of the IAs and might be further improved to guide the roster experts. However, more than half of the reviewers were of the opinion that one expert cannot cover all aspects of a project with equal competence and therefore felt the need to either consult with their networks or suggested that more than one expert be used in complementary ways.

With respect to the timing of the review, most experts were of the view that it came too late in the process when the project is "cast in stone", and experienced it as rather "rushed and cramped", and doubted their added value and impact. One recommendation made is that a two-step approach be adopted which might lead to better quality projects through assuring an early independent scientific input, followed by a later review. This approach was also recommended by STAP as a way of improving the review system. Not only would an earlier scientific input lead to more scientifically underpinned projects, but it may also encourage a better use of the expertise of the roster because of a less tight time frame.

It was agreed that a comprehensive technical document on the STAP Roster of Experts be prepared for general circulation to the GEF family. The meeting also considered the issue of inclusion in the STAP Roster of Experts in traditional knowledge and practices of indigenous and local communities. After much discussion, it was agreed that these elements should be as far as practicable be integrated in each GEF intervention. It was felt that it would be more effective if expertise in traditional knowledge and practices of indigenous communities could be involved in the project design process at the national and regional/sub-regional levels.

Agenda Item 6: Finalization of the Priority Issues Which STAP Should Address in GEF Phase III: Analysis and Discussion

A significant amount of effort was directed by the Panel in analyzing the priority areas which STAP should address in GEF Phase III. Following is a brief overview of some issues addressed by the Panel. A substantive report on this issue is also being prepared for consideration by the GEF Council at its May 2002 meeting.

(a) Biodiversity

Although the GEF biodiversity portfolio has focused on protected areas, there are still some remaining gaps, in coverage, in terms of representativeness and continuity, and in the management of protected areas. For example, important gaps exist in conservation outside of formally protected areas, especially of domesticated biodiversity and in production and other managed landscapes. In addition, there is a dearth of appropriate alternative technologies including locally developed technologies and livelihoods opportunities that are not fully appreciated and utilized in GEF funded projects; little has been done on issues such as benefit-sharing, payment for environmental services, incentives schemes and structures,, the impacts of GMOs and other emerging biotechnologies and the effective integration of environmental, economic, social, political, and cultural perspective on biodiversity conservation. The probable impacts of global change on biodiversity is still not fully understood and as yet, there are few projects that effectively addressing the linkages between these two focal areas.

As a consequence, some of the significant scientific questions of high priority issues which should be addressed in GEF III include the following:

- How to deploy local or indigenous ecological knowledge to develop plans for management of natural resources, including planning, implementation, monitoring and adaptively redesigning the management regime on the basis of learning through doing? How to combine folk and scientific knowledge?
- How to sustain and build upon traditional practices of conservation in the new and ever changing social, demographic, political, economic, technological contexts?
- How to decide on appropriate levels of economic incentives for provision of environmental services such as biodiversity conservation, watershed protection and carbon sequestration?
- How to promote conservation and prudent use of common property resources? How do social structures and institutions influence patterns of management of common property resources?
- How to reevaluate and manage green markets and trade in biodiversity?
- How to manage heterogeneous landscapes including conservation and production areas? How to design a system of conservation areas on different spatial scales and with different levels of human use? What are the roles of corridors, stepping stones in such systems?
- How predictable are complex natural systems? What are the implications of the limits to predictability in designing management regimes? How to update predictions of behavior of complex natural systems by assimilating information on the state of the system generated through ongoing monitoring

programs? How to design management interventions so as to maximize learning in the process of utilization? How to develop adaptive management regimes?

- How is rapid change in agroecosystems, including the replacement of diverse and cyclic small-holder systems by large-scale plantations of export crops affecting both wild and domesticated biodiversity?
- How to recuperate disturbed areas and reestablish ecosystem functions and habitats?
- How to redeploy effectively the financial resources today devoted to payment of subsidies to environmentally undesirable inputs such as synthetic pesticides, and to running the bureaucratic apparatus?
- What is the impact of emerging biotechnologies and GMOs on biodiversity?

(b) Land and Water Management

A review of the existing GEF Land and Water OPs, highlighted the following important gaps and emerging issues; namely; the need for the rationalization of the various OPs as to avoid overlap with the new generation OPs (i.e. integrated ecosystem management and POPs) and to bring a new holistic approach in solving the problems of Land and Water Management; the linkage between land and water management, and climate in the current portfolio is absent or weak; the need for an implementation of pilot projects devised to test new methods of pest control given the elimination of conventionally used substances of controlling pests and vectors, there is need.

In addition, recent findings indicate the risk of water contamination by trace amount of hormones, antibiotics and other substances excreted by humans and released by pharmaceutical and agriculture activities, and that reach water bodies via sewage and drainage water. There may be a case to reformulate OP9 to enable the OP address this growing problem. Furthermore, with the banning of the traditional and efficient method for controlling fouling in ship hulls, an increase in alien species transport may occur. This must be taken into consideration in the preparation of future ship related GEF projects.

As a consequence, priority issues which the GEF could address in GEF III include:

- Development of a flexible and adaptive approach to land and water management in the GEF portfolio;
- Methodologies for incorporating land and water management issues in adaptation issues;
- Development of an integrated perspective in the way the GEF addresses the issues related to land and water, biodiversity, climate change.
- Evaluation of science-based transboundary diagnostic analyses (TDAs) and strategic action plans (SAPs) is necessary to demonstrate their efficiency and benefits.

- Proposing initiatives that would improve the dissemination of available data on land degradation, water pollution and hydrological changes at various levels (space and time).
- Identification of the most appropriate community-centred approaches that are essential in addressing land and water management successfully. The proposed approaches should also provide methodologies for the incorporation of indigenous knowledge in developing and implementing land and water projects.
- Reorganization of OP10 should take account of the new OP that will address the POPs issue that is currently under preparation. It is also important that special attention is paid to the growing relevance of sewage contamination, which is more complex than the traditional concern over N and P contaminants.

(c) Climate Change

In the climate change focal area, a number of gaps were highlighted as being important. These are summarised below as follows:

Energy Efficiency – O#P5: Although some progress has been realized in the dissemination of energy efficient technologies and approaches, there remain significant challenges, particularly with respect to the improvement of the efficiency of future building stock.

Renewables – OP#6: Most of the technologies promoted in OP#6 have been aimed at the generation of electricity. With a significant proportion of the developing world still largely un-electrified and reliant on biofuels which are an important source of greenhouse gases, the current OP6 portfolio has not managed to develop and disseminate technologies and approaches that would significantly reduce greenhouse gases emissions from existing biofuel devices. This gap in the OP6 portfolio represents a major challenge that the evolving GEF portfolio needs to address.

Reducing Long-Term Costs of New Sustainable Energy Technologies – OP#7: Under OP#7, the GEF is able to support projects that are *technologically proven* but not yet *economical at market prices*; examples are fuel cells for decentralized generation; solar-thermal power plant; photo-voltaics for grid-connected applications; and, hydrogen production from coal using advanced coal-gasification technologies. In these instances the rationale is that:

There is a gap in the aggregate of current efforts across countries to develop the new technologies. Until they occupy roughly 2-5% of the market, it is not possible for them to compete with mature technologies—whose costs are also declining, albeit more slowly in relative terms—with technical progress. Exceptions are the ‘niche’ markets such as those that GEF projects under OP# 5 and 6 are focussed on. The financing requirements during this phase are too great for the GEF alone to shoulder. Yet many of the technologies are well suited to developing regions. The question is how the GEF or some sister organization

might work with national programs in the OECD countries to foster the emergence of the new technologies in developing regions

Transport – OP#11: The GEF Transport portfolio is currently dominated by technology-oriented options. As a consequence, more emphasis need to be paid to promoting non-technology options that can lead to significant modal shifts to more efficient and less polluting forms of public and freight city transport (i.e. from personal motorized transport to mass transit, buses, bicycles and walking).

Priority issues in the climate change focal area which the GEF could focus on are:

- **In the area of Energy Efficiency** Options for strengthening GEF’s role in improving the efficiency of future buildings stock in developing countries.
- **In Renewables** focus could be placed on innovative, low cost and sustainable initiatives aimed at reducing GHGEs from biofuels use in developing countries.
- **In Reducing the long-term costs of new sustainable energy technologies** – emphasis could be placed on effective institutional and financial mechanisms – involving both the private and public sector - for the establishment of a network of research centres of excellence in the developing world that would address the question of advancing renewable and energy efficiency technologies in the developing world.
- **In the area of Sustainable Transport** the most attractive options for diversifying the GEF portfolio should be considered. In addition, the question of how to reduce GHGEs from intra and inter-city freight transport; Propose institutional options for improving the collection and dissemination of data and information on the impact of various sustainable transport options; and innovative measures for enhancing participation, promotion, social marketing and awareness creation of sustainable transport options should be considered.
- **In the Cross-Cutting area** which is important to all the energy OPs emphasis could be placed on the evaluation of the importance of modularity as an ideal approach for GEF energy interventions; development of a flexible set of tools (regulatory, fiscal, technical guidelines) that promote sustainable energy in a rapidly reforming energy sector; evaluation of the impact of energy sector reforms (as well as reforms in other sectors with significant impact on energy use e.g. transport) on sustainable energy development (energy efficiency, renewables, clean transport modes, etc); options that would ensure the development of sustainable energy alternatives while capturing the benefits associated with market liberalization and competition; interventions that would ensure continued support (and possibly increased) for medium and long-term energy R&D in a reforming energy sector; win-win options that would promote sustainable energy in a rapidly reforming energy sector while ensure the provision of low-cost energy services to the rural and urban poor and measures that would protect the interests of the poor in GEF climate interventions.

Agenda Item 7: Preparation of the STAP contribution to the Second GEF Assembly:

27. Two substantive issues were considered by the Panel under this agenda item, namely, (a) the preparation of a report to the GEF Assembly on broad scientific and technical issues that emerged during GEF II and on emerging issues and gaps and (b) the organization of a scientific Panel as part of the activities for the GEF Assembly.

(a) Report to the Second GEF Assembly: It was agreed that the report to the Second GEF Assembly GEF will be entitled "*Highlights of the Work of STAP During GEF II (1998 – 2002) and Reflections on Emerging Scientific and Technical Issues.*"

It was agreed that the report will be structured as outlined below and prepared by the STAP Secretariat under the guidance of the STAP Chair.

The overall emphasis of the report will be on emerging scientific and technical issues and gaps arising out of GEF operation but also with a forward looking view. The experiences of STAP II through its activities in the GEF focal areas would provide the basis for the analysis of emerging issues and gaps. The suggested structure of the report is as follows:

- (i) Preface
- (ii) Introduction
- (iii) Strategic Advice
- (iv) The overall emphasis in the focal areas will be on "Emerging Scientific and Technical Issues and Gaps"

- (a) Biodiversity
 - (i) Sustainable Use of Biodiversity
 - ❖ Agrobiodiversity
 - ❖ Sustainable Forest Use
 - ❖ Biomarkers
 - ❖ Selective Reviews
 - (ii) Biosafety

- (b) Climate Change
 - ❖ Power Sector Reform;
 - ❖ Technology Reviews;
 - ❖ Solar Thermal Projects (OTEC; Fuel Cell, Integrated Coal Gasification Combine Cycle (IGCC, PVs, IFCS);
 - ❖ Vulnerability and Adaptation to Climate Change;
 - ❖ Selective Reviews
 - ❖ Sustainable Transport

- (c) Integrated Land and Water Management

- ❖ Persistent Organic Pollutants;
- ❖ Land Degradation Interlinkages;
- ❖ Community-based Integrated Land and Water Management;
- ❖ Integrated Ecosystem Management;
- ❖ East African Lakes;
- ❖ Global International Waters Assessment;
- ❖ Selective Reviews;
- ❖ Emerging Issues and Gaps

(v) Annexes

Annex I: Products produced by STAP during Phase II

Annex II: Acronyms

(b) Scientific panel at the GEF Assembly

It was agreed that STAP should convene a scientific panel on the theme “*Environmental Assessment for Achieving GEF Impact*”. The overall objective of the STAP side event is to review the emerging scientific and technical findings emerging from ongoing global environmental assessment including those financed through the GEF, with a view of identifying priorities for future GEF direction as a contribution to the GEF endeavours aimed at achieving and maximizing impacts. An interdisciplinary Panel of five eminent scientists from developed and developing countries with recognized international stature in biodiversity, climate change, international waters, persistent organic pollutants and land degradation will make key presentation. The session will be chaired by the STAP Chair.

The presentations will aim at highlighting the emerging scientific and technical findings of major ongoing or recent global environmental assessments of relevance to the GEF. The Panel will focus its attention on the status and trends of major barriers of, or threats to, the environment in the GEF focal areas based on a review of the GEF financed activities including the Global Biodiversity Assessment, the Global International Waters Assessment, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, the Regionally-based Assessment on Persistent Toxic Substances, the Land Degradation Dryland Assessment, the Solar and Wind Resources Assessment, the Mountain Assessment. The Panel will also take into account the findings of relevant environmental assessment not financed by the GEF including the UNEP Third Global Environment Outlook, the Third Assessment Report of IPCC, the Biodiversity outlook prepared by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biodiversity as well as the coral reef assessment and the FAO forest assessment.

It was agreed that further discussion on the scientific panel will take place at the Joint Meeting of the Incoming and Outgoing STAP to be convened in June 2002.

Agenda Item 8: Finalisation of Products to be submitted to the GEF Council:

The following substantive issues were addressed under this agenda item. A substantive document on each of these issues will be submitted separately for consideration by the GEF Council:

(a) Report of STAP Expert Group Workshop on Adaptation;

Prof. Shuzo Nishioka presented the results of the STAP Expert Group Workshop held in Nairobi from February 18-20, 2002. The specific aims and objectives of the STAP Expert Group Workshop on Adaptation and Vulnerability were:

- (i) Provide the GEF with scientific and technical advice on how to operationalise the guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties, taking into consideration:
 - The current level of scientific and technical knowledge in adaptation;
 - The difficulties in distinguishing between impacts resulting from climate variability and climate change;
 - The regional differences in terms of vulnerability and adaptive capacity;
 - The social, economic and environmental impacts of adaptation as well as the need to address this issue within the overall context of sustainable development.
- (ii) Identify gaps in current scientific knowledge in terms of integrating adaptation concerns into mainstream development in specific sectors;
- (iii) Provide advice on how to integrate adaptation concerns into mainstream development projects in specific sectors in a scientifically sound manner;
- (iv) Develop guidelines for the formulation of a framework and/or an approach for the GEF to fund adaptation interventions;
- (v)** Outline the main elements of a targeted research agenda for adaptation, based on the gaps identified in (ii).

The Expert Group Workshop was structured in such a manner so as to facilitate a "bottom-up" approach focusing on case studies and ongoing experiences of adaptation activities. It was structured around three major elements, namely: a background paper commissioned by STAP; a number of case studies presented by operational experts involved in project design and implementation in the various sectors (i.e. agriculture, water resources management, urban planning, health, ecosystem/biodiversity conservation etc.) and working group sessions. The meeting addressed a wide cross-section of issues including gaps in scientific knowledge including tools and methodologies, technologies; barriers mitigating against the practical incorporation/integration of adaptation measures into sectoral policies, plans and development projects; lessons learnt from practical experiences in the field, priority areas of intervention and criteria for prioritization and selection of adaptation interventions.

A number of specific recommendations were made to assist the GEF in the formulation of a GEF Strategy for Adaptation. Following are some of the principle areas of focus which should be considered in the design of the Adaptation Strategy.

- (a) In general, it was agreed that the Adaptation Strategy should take its grounding on a number of specific characteristics (especially in contrast with mitigation strategy) of adaptation to climate change, namely:

- (i) ***The object is the local environment as a whole, where human and nature coexist and consist of the vernacular identity which needs to be sustained:*** A holistic view of this local environment is essential, since most adaptation measures, are likely to be site specific.
- (ii) ***Adaptation relates to multiple global change issues:*** Climate change is only one of a number of global changes, which is taking place. The Strategy should therefore be multi-purpose, simultaneously addressing other issues (i.e. local pollution, loss of biodiversity, soil degradation, inland water problem etc.) in an integrated way.
- (iii) ***Adaptation is response to local impacts caused by global scale phenomena:*** The Adaptation strategy will require fusion of a "top-down" approach that identify impacts from global scale climate change, and "bottom-up" approach rooted in local, national and regional experiences.
- (iv) ***Decisions are made under scientific and societal uncertainty:*** Since current science has not matured enough to forecast plausible patterns of local impacts, to identify existing vulnerability and to evaluate the effectiveness of responding measures to climate change, the Adaptation Strategy should not be deterministic but rather be flexible and based on the risk management concept.
- (v) ***Wide scope insight is needed in terms of exposure unit and associated stakeholders:*** Climate change gives sequential impacts, hence consideration should be given to adaptation measures in individual stages, as well as integrating policies throughout the stages.
- (vi) ***Actors of adaptation are diversified:*** Unlike mitigation, adaptation issues address a wide cross-section of stakeholders at every level of society. In designing adaptation measures, it will be critical to have stakeholders' involvement in early stage of planning, if establishing and implementing adaptation measures are to be successful.
- (vii) ***Climate change proceeds slowly but steadily, and is accompanied by various delays:*** Generally, climate impacts proceed slowly but steadily, although some abrupt changes and extremes are anticipated. The strategy should have long-term perspective and be anticipatory, stepwise and adaptive. The decision making process should be sequential and flexible, and renewed continuously by feeding back updated scientific information.
- (viii) ***Long-lived nature of impacts and adaptation:*** The impacts of global change will last long and continuously. The responding measures should not be a one-off intervention. Continuous follow-

up efforts, stakeholders involvement, monitoring and evaluating effectiveness of adaptation policy are indispensable.

- (ix) ***Adaptation must be economically efficient, contribute to the advancement of social and environmental objectives:*** Adaptation activities should be designed to support national economic objectives including social objectives and should be compatible with long-term environmental objectives.

- (b) Taking into consideration foregoing specific characteristics of impacts of and adaptation to climate change, a number of scientific and socio-managerial gaps remain to be filled. The Adaptation Strategy should therefore be formulated in such a way so as to enable these gaps to be addressed. These include, in the scientific area: fusion of "top-down" and "bottom-up" approaches to climate scenario building; the establishment of a framework for an evolutionary adaptation approach using the risk management concept considering the existing uncertainty and delay and structuring synergetic adaptation policy with other global and regional environmental issues, such as biodiversity, soil erosion, inland waters and urban pollution. The need for value judgement and quantification particularly with respect to criteria on how to evaluate and respect local values and ensure their complementarity with wider common and global value as well as to characterize and quantify them into indicators usable for decision-making is also of importance. In addition, consideration must be given to the establishment of criteria for judging the rationale for GEF climate investment, in place of incremental cost: how to quantify global benefits of local adaptation? How is the baseline set for quantifying benefits of adaptation measures. The establishment methods for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of adaptation measures, including development of indicators and integration of socio-economic consideration into adaptation are also critical.

Social and managerial challenges includes the development of participatory procedures from the early stage of adaptation policy-making; the development and dissemination of user friendly guidance for example, practical guidance in designing a framework for adaptation and setting priorities among alternative measures, targeted both to local people and donors and collaborators.

In terms of implementation considerations with the view of facilitating the effective implementation of the GEF Adaptation Strategy, consideration should be given to a cross-cutting operational policy instead of the convention-wise sectoral approach as well as the revision of the incremental cost concept when applied to adaptation. Unlike mitigation activities, which aim at reducing atmospheric greenhouse-gas concentrations, the global benefits related to adaptation activities are likely to be intangible or more difficult to measure, this would necessitate lowering the baseline for adaptation activities. It is also highly recommended that adaptation measures be designed in such a manner to support sustainable development efforts.

Consideration could be given to structuring GEF programming in the following manner:

- (i) **Science and Technology:** The gaps in scientific knowledge suggest that there is a need to prioritize, plan, implement and evaluate adaptation options as well as the strengthening and/or development of methodologies. In this regard, targeted research should be promoted. Lack of availability of historical data in many sector hinders scientific assessment.
- (ii) **Capacity Building:** Enhancing local resilience capacity to cope with climate variability and change is suggested to be the core. It is also the most flexible way of responding to uncertain future climate. Not only should public participation be strengthened but also enhancement of local scientific knowledge and utilization of indigenous knowledge. It is important to ensure the participation of local experts and people in the planning of GEF project at an early stage.
- (iii) **Investment Interventions:** Hard type investment works efficiently when incorporated into mainstream development. Assessment and consideration to the local and national size urban planning, river basin management, integrated coastal zone management needs to be well preceded to concrete investment. Deliberative stepwise screening is necessary so as to avoid mal-adaptation caused by irreversible hard type investments.

In addition, since the integration of adaptation measures into mainstream development will necessitate a multi-stakeholder approach, specific consideration should be given to the role of the private sector in adaptation planning and implementation. In most developing countries, private investment is far greater than official development assistance.

(b) **Sourcebook on Community-Based Integrated Land and Water Management**

Prof. Paola Rossi gave an update of the status of the preparation of the "*Sourcebook on Integrated Land and Water Management*". She reported that a number of case studies on the implementation of community-based approaches to integrated land and water management are being developed with focus on Africa, in support of Africa Land and Water Initiative. The specific objectives of the case studies are to compile, synthesize, and disseminate good practices in community-based application of integrated land and water management, including traditional systems. This activity would support ongoing efforts by the GEF and other organizations to facilitate wider adoption of the integrated land and water management approaches. In addition, the case studies will assist in the understanding of different community-based management systems, including their origin and rationale for the adoption of these systems, major practitioners, management practices and their institutional framework (e.g. decision-making processes) and the enabling environment needed to sustain these systems.

The case studies are currently being analyzed by an Editorial Committee comprising of STAP members and three external experts. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Editorial Committee be convened in Bologna, Italy from April 24-27, 2002. It was also agreed that since the Sourcebook will not be

completed until June 2002, the Editorial Committee should, as part of the work, prepare a brochure on the Sourcebook for distribution at the GEF Council at its meeting in May 2002. The brochure should give an overview of the case studies to be included in the Sourcebook.

(c) Report of STAP Brainstorming on Sustainable Transportation

Dr. Stephen Karekezi reported on the STAP Brainstorming on Sustainable Transport convened immediately before the STAP Meeting on March 25-26, 2002.

The central issue which provided the context for the workshop is that the GEF Transport portfolio (Operation Programme, OP11) is currently dominated by technology-oriented options. (i.e. initiatives promoting fuel cell technology and electric/hybrid vehicles) which constitute close to 70% of the portfolio. There is a concern that only a limited number of GEF initiatives have been designed that aimed at promoting non-technology options that can lead to significant modal shifts to more efficient and less polluting forms of public and freight city transport (i.e. from personal motorized transport to mass transit, buses, bicycles and walking).

A number of studies indicate that non-technology options for stimulating modal shifts can ensure short-term as well as long-term abatement of GHGs emissions from urban transport systems at relatively low cost. Examples include integrated urban, land-use and transportation planning; increased reliance on bus systems; traffic management and avoidance; and, fuel/vehicle tax/import duty policies. While it is somewhat intuitively straightforward to see how such non-technology options can lead to long-term modal shifts to low-GHGs urban transport systems, it is less clear which set of options should be given priority in a developing country context. The criteria for the selection of appropriate options and the ideal sequence of implementation of identified options are also largely unknown.

A number of presentations comprising of background papers by leading transport energy experts; papers on model case examples and upstream consultation, pipeline and ongoing projects that are designed to promote non-technology options for supporting sustainable urban transportation systems were made at the Brainstorming Session. While each region has its specific recommendations which reflect their unique characteristics, there was a general consensus on a number of options that are likely to be the most beneficial and deserve special attention from proponents of future GEF sustainable transport initiatives. These include:

- ❖ Public Rapid Transit (PRT) which encompasses Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Trolley Electric Buses (Tbuses).
- ❖ Traffic Demand Management (TDM) which includes parking measures, traffic cells, areas licensing (restricted zones) and congestion pricing.
- ❖ Non-Motorized Transport (NMT) which encompasses physically separate NMT lanes and networks, traffic calming, strengthening NMT manufacturing and/or maintenance enterprises and improving NMY vehicles.

- ❖ Land-Use Planning (LUP) through regulatory measures (zoning laws) and judicious location of new public facilities such as schools, hospitals, police stations and playgrounds (i.e. place public facilities in transit-friendly locations).

In addition, the importance of a number of cross-cutting issues that should be addressed irrespective of the option that is being promoted were highlighted, namely: Collection and dissemination of data and information on options and respective impact, and participation, promotion, social marketing and awareness creation. It was also recognised that the criteria for prioritization would differ with location and type of the option that is being promoted. There was consensus on that the dissemination of the success stories is still inadequate. It is therefore being recommended that GEF considers the possibility of organizing regional workshops (starting with Africa which currently has not full OP 11 project) to encourage the adoption of the aforementioned proven and successful non-technology measures to a wider audience.

Because of the time limitations, the meeting did not address the issue of freight transport. It was however recommended that this issue should be revisited by STAP in the future.

Agenda Item 9: The Joint Meeting of the Incoming and Outgoing STAP

It was agreed that an orientation session will be convened on June 17-18, 2002 for members of STAP III. The Eleventh Meeting of STAP II will be convened on June 19, 2002. This will provide the opportunity for STAP II to wrap up its substantive work with the view of handing over to STAP III.

The Joint Meeting of STAP II and STAP III will be convened on June 20-21, 2002 commencing on June 20, 2002 with an opening session to be addressed by the Heads of Agencies.

The preliminary draft agenda as agreed for the Joint Meeting is as follows:

Day 1:

- A.M. (a) Official Session including Statements by the Heads of Agencies
- (b) Discussion on Outstanding Issues that might be taken over by STAP III (i.e. POPs Workshop/ Report, etc.)
- (c) Presentation by STAP II on Priority Scientific and Technical Issues.

P.M.

- (a) Ad-Hoc Working Group Sessions
- (b) Presentation Dinner

Day 2:

A.M. Presentation by STAP II on Emerging Issues and Gaps

P.M. Informal Meeting of STAP III

Agenda Item 10: Any Other Business

(a) Lunch Time Presentations

As an integral part of the STAP Meeting and in the interest of strengthening relations with scientific and technical entities, a number of lunch time seminars were convened. These included presentations from ICRAF, ICIPE, ILRI and IPGRI. OAU gave a presentation on the outcome of their conference on Policies and Directions on Science and Technology for Sustainable Development in African Countries in the Decade 2001-2010.

(b) Participation in Meetings

The meeting agreed that Prof. Paola Rossi should represent STAP at the International Soil Conservation Organization 12th Conference, to be held in China from May 26-31, 2002. She will present, on behalf of STAP, a paper entitled "Land and Water Management Strategies for a Sustainable Environment: The GEF Experience".

(c) STAP Publications

It was agreed that an effort should be made to publish some of the STAP reports produced during STAP II to facilitate wider circulation.

Agenda Item 11: Adoption of Report

The meeting adopted the Report of the Ninth Meeting of STAP II which was held in Washington, D.C., October, 2001. It was also agreed that the draft report of the Tenth Meeting of STAP II will be circulated to all participants for comments in April 2002.

Agenda Item 12: Closing of the Meeting

The Meeting closed at 5.00 p.m. on 29 March, 2002.

**STAP Expert Group Workshop on Innovative Technologies
for the Elimination and Disposal of POPs
June 12-14, 2002, Washington, D.C.**

Introduction

In recent years, there have been growing international consensus on the reduction and/or elimination of releases of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) into the environment. The successful conclusion of Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC)¹ with the mandate to prepare an internationally legally binding instrument for implementing international action on certain POPs and the designation of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as the financial mechanism of the Convention, have greatly increased the potential of GEF interventions in this area.

As a response, the GEF has prepared Draft Elements of an Operational Programme for "*Reducing and Eliminating Releases of POPs into the Environment*" as its policy framework for GEF interventions. In addition, the GEF has given priority to funding the development of National Implementation Plans (POPs enabling activities). Enabling activities, as defined in the GEF Operational Strategy, represents a building block of GEF assistance to countries. They either are means of fulfilling essential communication requirements to a Convention, provide a basic and essential level of information to enable policy and strategic decisions to be made, or assist planning that identifies priority activities within a country².

Notwithstanding these initiatives, the GEF has requested the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP), to provide further³ strategic advice on POPs, particularly with an emphasis on innovative technologies for the elimination and/or destruction of POPs. As a response, STAP will convene an Expert Group Workshop on "Innovative Technologies".

Aims and Objectives

The Expert Group Workshop will address the following specific aims and objectives with the view of providing the GEF with strategic advice on innovative technologies for the elimination and/or destruction of POPs.

The specific aims of the Workshop are:

- (i) Review the status of stockpiles and the technologies for their handling and containment;

1 The INC focused on twelve specific persistent organic pollutants, namely: Aldrin, Chlordane, Dieldrin, DDT, Endrin, Mirex, Toxophen, Hexachlorobenzene, PCB, Dioxins, Furans

2 For a more detailed outline of the areas which could be addressed by enabling activities as well as full and medium size project see "Draft Elements of An Operational Programme for the Reducing and Eliminating Releases of POPs into the Environment"

3 STAP convened a Brainstorming on POPs in February 2000. The output of that Brainstorming Session was used by the GEF as the basis for the preparation of its "Draft Elements of an Operational Programme for Reducing and Eliminating Releases of POPs into the Environment"

- (ii) Provide updated information for the elimination and disposal of POPs;
- (iii) Provide an overview of existing technologies and their requirements and adequacy for . . .
- (iv) Evaluate traditional and innovative technologies for managing POPs in a manner protective of human health and the environment as well as cost effectively;
- (v) Formulate criteria and guidelines for technology selection, taking into consideration regional differences, conditions and constraints and taking into account the work undertaken by the bodies of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal;
- (vi) Explore the need for technology transfer.

Structure of the Workshop

The Expert Group Workshop will be structured in such a manner so as to facilitate an in-depth analysis of the issues of the status of stockpiles and the use of innovative and/or indigenous technologies for their elimination and destruction. Sufficient time will be allocated to enable consideration of technical details so as to provide useful guidelines which will be of benefit to the GEF.

- (i) **Background Paper:** To facilitate a focused discussion on the issues of stockpiles and innovative technologies, background papers will be prepared on each of these topics. Given FAO's experience in dealing with stockpile, that organisation will be requested to prepare a background document on "*The status of stockpiles and the technologies being currently used for Handling and Containment*". This paper will address the following issues:

- Information regarding quality, quantity and age;
- Safety and general status of concern;
- Review of current technologies being employed for elimination and/or destruction of POPs;
- Constraints and/or barriers.

STAP on the other hand, will commission a paper on "Innovative Technologies". The background paper on innovative technologies will focus on the following themes:

- Overview of innovative and indigenous technologies for the elimination and disposal of POPs;
- Identification of a selection of key promising technologies, their application to date, barriers mitigation against wide spread use if any; and what can be done to make them operational;
- How to approach the issue of criteria for the selection of innovative and indigenous technologies.

- (ii) **Case Studies:** A number of case studies on specific countries experiences with the elimination and/or disposal of POPs will be presented with the view of outlining what is feasible within the various constraints faced by countries. In addition, focus will also be placed on major current initiatives (i.e. African Stockpile Programme) being undertaken.

- (iii) **Working Group Sessions:** A number of Working Groups will be convened as an integral part of the Workshop to consider in greater detail the substantive issues arising out of the background papers.
- (iv) **Output:** The following output will result from the meeting and will be further amplified by STAP.
- Specific information on the range of innovative technology which have been experimented with technologies that are being developed and the identification of promising technologies and how can they be further developed.
 - Advice on how GEF interventions could contribute to the operationalisation of promising innovative technologies for the elimination and/or destruction of POPs.
 - Overview of the status of stockpiles, the outstanding issues which need to be addressed and advice on GEF's role in that process.

Draft Preliminary Agenda

Day I: Wednesday, 12 June, 2002

Official Opening

- 9.00 a.m. Opening Remarks by Representatives of UNEP
- Statement by Prof. Madhav Gadgil, STAP Chairman
- Statement: Representative of the GEF Secretariat
- Statement: Representative of POPs Convention

9.45 a.m. Coffee Break

Plenary Session 1: Background and Context of the Workshop

Chair: Prof. Paola Rossi, STAP Member

- 10.15 a.m. Aims and Objectives of the Workshop by Prof. Angela Wagener
- Discussion
- 10.40 a.m. Overview of GEF Activities on POPs: Representative of the GEF Secretariat
- Discussion
- 11.20 a.m. Background Paper 1: Overview of the Status of Stock Piles: Representative of FAO
- Discussion

12.20 p.m. Background Paper 2: Innovative Technologies Prospects and Constraints

Discussion

1.30 p.m. Lunch

2.00 p.m. Plenary Session 2: Approach to Stock Piles Elimination and Destruction

African Stock Pile Programme: Representative of the World Bank

2.30 p.m. Case Study: The Thailand Experience to Disposal and Elimination of POPs

3.30 p.m. Coffee

4.00 p.m. Panel Discussion: Stock Piles: Status Issues and Directions for the Future

5.30 p.m. Closure of Meeting

Day 2: Thursday, 13 June, 2002

9.00 a.m. Opening of Meeting

9.10 a.m. Innovative Technologies: The Australian Experience

Discussion

10.00 a.m. Case Study

11.00 a.m. Panel Discussion: Innovative Technologies: Prospects and Constraints

1.00 p.m. Lunch

2.30 p.m. Working Group Sessions

5.30 p.m. Closure of the Meeting

Day 3: Friday, 14 June, 2002

9.00 a.m. Opening of the Meeting

9.05 a.m. Reporting and presentations by the Working Groups

11.00 a.m. Finalization of the reports of the Working Groups

1.00 p.m. Lunch

2.30 p.m. Plenary discussion

4.30 p.m. Closure of the Meeting